

Remarks

Applicants note that the French patent document cited in the Information Disclosure Statement (IDS) of October 17, 2000 was not considered as it was not accompanied by a concise explanation. Applicants note that the IDS was accompanied by a copy of the International Search Report from the corresponding International Application, and the International Search Report provided the Category A designation for the French document as to claim 1. In any event, applicants note that Australian Patent No. 733631 corresponds to the French document. Applicants enclose an Information Disclosure Citation wherein the Australian patent is listed. A copy of the Australian patent is enclosed from which, of course, it can be seen that it's in the English text. Applicants believe no fee is due at this time. However, if any fees are owed in connection with this communication, please charge deposit account no. 18-2284 (a duplicate copy of this communication is enclosed for that purpose).

Applicants respectfully traverse the Examiner's objection to the specification. A substitute specification is provided herewith, which has been amended in order to address the comments raised by the Examiner.

Applicants respectfully traverse the Examiner's objection to the claims, as well as the rejection of claim 4 under 35 USC §112, 2nd paragraph. The claims have been amended in order to address the Examiner's comments.

Applicants respectfully traverse the Examiner's rejection of the claims as obvious over SISKKA in view of WILKINSON.

As an aside, applicants note that the original application included claims 1-11. The original application also included a preliminary amendment wherein the original claims 1-11 were cancelled and new claims were submitted with a request that they be renumbered (e.g. as new claims 12-22). The amended claims being presented herein are based on the new claims 12-22 which were filed with the original application.

Claims 12, 15, 18 and 21 have been amended for clarification. More particularly, these claims recite now the way that the program language interpreter distinguishes standard codes and specific codes for executing specific instructions when the compacted program is run.

This clarification has been brought to these independent claims in order to stress the importance of the content of the execution table.

More particularly, the cited document SISKa does not really teach an execution table which enables a reciprocal link to be established between each specific code and the sequence of successive standard instructions. The program interpreter according to the invention is therefore arranged for reading the content of the execution table and for decompacting the program previously stored, in order to run the program.

The cited document SISKa fails to teach an execution table which enables a reciprocal link between the specific code and the standard code for the mere reason that a program language interpreter is not provided in SISKa, as admitted in the office action (first lines of page 8 of the office action).

On the other hand, the JAVA interpreter of WILKINSON is merely a conventional interpreter.

On the opposite, the interpreter according to the invention makes it possible to execute a compacted program and, therefore, has to carry out the decompacting of such a program (see for example the "*decompression table*" of Figure 4 and in page 4, line 19 of the application as filed). More particularly, a test step 2003 in Figure 4 is run in order to determine whether a code value belongs or does not belong to "*standard codes*" (see also page 16, lines 29-34). For guidance, the specification further indicates that if a negative response is received to test 2003 (the read code corresponds to an instruction of the standard type), the interpreter checks whether the value of this code corresponds to an end of the sequence.

Therefore, the program interpreter according to the invention is not of a conventional type and does not derive from WILKINSON or SISKa, even taken in combination, for a man

skilled in the art. The execution table which is read by the program interpreter is not suggested by SISK A and cannot correspond to the MCT 218 provided in SISK A.

Therefore, the subject-matter of the independent claims 12, 15, 18 and 21, as now clarified, is new and non-obvious with regard to SISK A and WILKINSON.

In view of the foregoing comments and amendment, applicants respectfully request the Examiner find claims 12-22 allowable over the prior art of record.

Respectfully submitted,


Michael L. Kenaga
Reg. No. 34,639

PIPER RUDNICK
P.O. Box 64807
Chicago, Illinois 60664-0807
Phone: 312/368-4000

Customer No.: 28465